CHHOT (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH

BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ Petition No. 2579 /2002.

Petitioner -- Jiwanlal Dewangan,
aged about 29 years,
S/o Late Shri Mahesh Ram Dewangan,
village & Post - Vinayakpur
Distt. DURG (C.G.).

Versus.

Respondents -- (1) The Chairman
Madhya Pradesh Electricity Board,
Shakti Bhawan,
Rampur,
Jabalpur (M.P.)

P.R. No. 2537/02
Presented by Shri M.K. Rai Adv.
dated 24/11/02

(2) The Chairman,
Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board,
Danganía, RAIPUR.

(3) Officer on Special Duty
Govt.of Chhattisgarh Energy Deptt.,
Secretariate
Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan,
RAIPUR (C.G.).

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS OR CERTIORARY OR PROHIBATION AND OR WRIT OF ANY OTHER NATURE AND OR ORDER OR DIRECTION.

XI-HC-22

(46)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 85-79/2002 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

26-3-2004

Shri R. M. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for respondent No.3.

Heard both the counsel.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India whereby the petitioner has prayed for directing the respondents to consider and appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground.

The petitioner's case is that his father was working under the Executive Engineer, M.P.E.B., Balod, in their distribution centre at Gurur as Lineman and his father while serving under respondent No.1 had expired on 27-11-99 due to illness. On 13-12-99, the petitioner had submitted an application for appointment on compassionate ground. The said application was forwarded by the Executive Engineer, M.P.E.B., Balod to the higher authorities. The petitioner had contacted to various offices of respondent No.1 to know the status of his application. But, respondent No.1 kept the application of the petitioner pending without any reasonable ground.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.2 has issued appointment orders in respect of 31 persons on compassionate ground. Counsel further submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondents 1 & 2 and respondents 1 & 2 may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner to which the learned counsel for respondent No.3 has no objection.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances to respondents 1&2 within a period of 10 days from today and in turn, respondents 1&2 will decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation considering all the grievances of the petitioner and will pass a reasoned order. In view of this order, I.A. No.9598/2003 stands disposed of. With the aforesaid directions, this writ petition is disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	

Barve Sunita